

SOURCE MATERIAL ON THE STUDY OF THE QUESTION
OF INDEMNITIES

I. Statements from Authorities on International Law.

- A. Absolute Power of the State in International Indemnities 2
 Borchard: Diplomatic Protection of Citizens Abroad.
 William M. Evarts.
 William Howard Taft.
 State Department Communication to Foreign Missions Conference of N.A.
- B. General Principles upon which Claims are Based 5
 Borchard: Diplomatic Protection of Citizens Abroad.
- C. Method of Making Claims 6
 Secretary of State Hay.

II. Missionary Attitude toward Indemnities:

- A. Opinion in Indemnities prior to the Boxer Uprising 9
 Dr. S. L. Baldwin in Report of Foreign Missions Conference of N.A.
 1896
- B. After the Boxing Uprising in 1900; Opinion for and against Indemnities 10
 Dr. F. F. Sherwood.
 Dr. C. F. Reid.
 Bd. of Foreign Missions, Reformed Church in America, 1901.
 Resolution of a Conference of American Missionary Societies 1901.
 China Inland Mission.
 Church Missionary Society & C.E.Z.M.S.
 Bd. of Foreign Missions, Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. 1906.
- C. World Missionary Conference, Edinburgh, 1910 14
 Report of Commission Seven.
- D. China, 1910-1926 17
 Statement in Chinese Recorder, 1910.
 Statement in China Mission Year Book 1924.
 Statement by Dr. D. E. Hoste, 1924.
 Statement by T. C. Chao, 1924.
 Dr. R. E. Speer; Report on Japan and China, 1926.
 Dr. James L. Barton, 1924.
- E. Statements of Policy, 1927 24
 Bd. of Foreign Missions, Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.
 Y. M. C. A.
 Bd. of Foreign Missions of the American Friends.
 Conference of Missionary Societies of Great Britain and Ireland.

III. Questions to be Considered 26

(Note: This paper is not intended to present any conclusions regarding the policy that the missionary boards should adopt. Its purpose is only to make generally available a considerable number of pertinent statements that may assist each Board in determining for itself the policy that it will adopt. It may be that this paper may serve as a basis for joint discussion of this subject, if that is found desirable. Comments on the subject and answers to the suggested questions are invited.

A. L. Warnshuis
 New York City, May 6, 1927.)

I.

STATEMENTS OF AUTHORITIES ON INTERNATIONAL LAW.

From the legal point of view the subject of indemnities, or claims made by the citizens of one country for injuries to their persons or property in another country is one of the most complicated problems in international law.

A. Absolute Power of the State in International Indemnities.

Under certain conditions an injury to an individual becomes a matter of international negotiation. When this is so the government, claiming the indemnity, acts as sovereign power, entirely independent of the person injured, in treating with the government within whose borders the injury occurred. It is important that this fact be fully appreciated in order to understand the situation in China today.

This right of the State to protect its citizens and their property is based, according to Dr. Edwin Borchard, on the theory formulated by Vattel:

" 'Whoever uses a citizen ill, indirectly offends the state, which is bound to protect this citizen; and the sovereign of the latter should avenge his wrongs, punish the aggressor, and, if possible, oblige him to make full reparation; since otherwise the citizen would not obtain the great end of the civil association, which is, safety.' (Vattel, Chitty-Inghraham ed., Phila., 1855, Bk. II, ch. VI Para. 71) The indirect injury which the state sustains by an injury to one of its citizens warrants bringing into operation the state's protective machinery."*

In discussing this point further Borchard leaves no doubt as to the full power of the Government in the protection of its citizens and their property and the extent to which this power is used. He says,

"The discretionary power of the Executive in the presentation of diplomatic claims, and in respect of the time, extent and means of pressure enables the Department of State to exercise the fullest control over claims... Claims arising out of certain torts, of an especially flagrant and serious nature, such as murder, mob violence, etc., are usually pressed at once by the United States and other governments, without requiring the exhaustion of local remedies. (E. G., Lienchou riots in China, 1904; Grenada Massacre of October 13, 1856). The Department,

*Borchard, Edwin M. - The Diplomatic Protection of Citizens Abroad.

moreover, has the right to prosecute a claim against a foreign government either in its original form, to modify it, or to effect a compromise without the permission of the claimant, and without rendering itself responsible to the claimant by reason of the exercise of such discretionary powers. In the protection of the citizen, the government's authority and the powers are plenary. The citizen is bound by its action, and must accept the measure of protection which the Executive officials in the exercise of their sound discretion deem it proper to afford."*

Again he says:

"... The government is the sole judge of what claims it will enforce, and of the manner, time, means and extent of enforcement. It may refuse to present a claim at all. After espousal of a claim, the government may abandon it, submit it to arbitration or make any disposition thereof which it deems expedient in the public interest, e.g., the government may compromise it, or release it, without compensation or for a consideration of benefit to the general public."**

In discussing the point of sovereign authority Dr. Borchard specifically mentions the rights of citizens to withdraw claims. He states that:

"The government may prosecute a claim arising out of an injury to a citizen notwithstanding the fact that the citizen declines to make any complaint (This happened in certain cases of missionaries murdered in the Lionchou riots, 1904) or renounces his right to an indemnity. (British Vice-Consul Magee in 1874 expressly renounced all indemnity for an outrage against him committed by a local governor in Guatemala, on the ground that his personal interests would suffer thereby. Notwithstanding the renunciation, and a salute to the British flag by Guatemala, Great Britain pressed and collected a claim for L 10,000 indemnity. 65 St. Pap. 875, at 900; Baty, 171). Nevertheless, unless the offense is particularly flagrant or may be deemed a national affront, the individual's waiver of a right to indemnity weakens the moral, if not the legal, right of his government to demand reparation, and the government may well consider itself justified in desisting from pressing a claim waived by the individual who actually sustained injury. Arbitral tribunals have regarded a private waiver of a claim as a bar to an international reclamation."***

William M. Everts, former Secretary of State, emphatically states that

"The first duty of a government is to protect life and property. This is a paramount obligation. For this governments are instituted, and governments neglecting or failing to perform it become worse than useless."****

*Borchard p. 365

**Borchard p. 366

***Borchard p. 371-372

****The Nation, April 13, 1927, p. 392.

President Taft said in December 1909:

"A citizen cannot by contract or otherwise divest himself of the right, nor can this government escape the obligation, of his protection in his personal and property rights when these are unjustly infringed in a foreign country." *

Moreover, this principle of the absolute authority of the State in matters of the protection of its citizens has been expressly stated to the Foreign Missions Conference of North America by the State Department. Dr. James L. Barton, Chairman, Subcommittee on Missions and Governments, Regarding Privileges Accorded to and Responsibilities of American Missionaries Under Existing Treaties with China, has made known this communication. He says:

"... I have in my possession a statement that I understand is being circulated in China for signatures, in which the signers expressed their 'earnest desire that no form of military pressure be exerted to protect us or our property; that in the event of our capture by lawless persons or our death at their hands, no money be paid for our release, no punitive expedition be sent out, no indemnity exacted.' This statement virtually, for the signers, abrogates their rights under the treaties existing between China and the United States, giving extra-territorial privileges to all American citizens.

"I have taken up the matter with the State Department and have received from the Department a ruling in terms as follows:

" 'In general, American citizens are not entitled to waive rights of the character to which you refer. The treaties concluded between China and the United States are contracts between two Governments. They expressly provide that American citizens in China shall enjoy, with respect to their person and property, the protection of the legal authorities of government, and that they shall be exempted from the processes of Chinese law. The observance of these provisions of the treaties this government has a right to insist upon and doubtless would insist upon irrespective of the wishes of particular individuals who may be influenced by religious or other beliefs. It has been repeatedly held that a citizen cannot, by his individual act, control the right of his government to intervene or afford protection in an appropriate case.

" 'With reference to the exercise of extra-territorial rights, Congress has furthermore enacted legislation extending to American citizens in China the laws of the United States. No American citizen in China, so long as he remains such, can waive the application to his person or property of such laws by the claim of a preference to be subject to the laws of China. The surrender of such rights by a portion of the American

* Speer, Robert. Report on Japan and China, 1926, p. 432.

community in China even if by a very small number of individuals would seriously impair the whole system of the treaties as designed for the protection of all classes of American citizens in that country.' This statement sets forth the attitude of the Department of State with respect to this subject."*

B. General Principles Upon Which Claims Are Based

The United States Government, therefore, being responsible for the presentation of claims, the amount claimed and the method of pressing the claim, the international law on the subject automatically becomes the problem of the government. Missions or individuals have no legal right to interfere.

The law on this subject is extremely complicated. The major cases fall roughly into the following categories; claims for acts of individuals, brigandage, mob violence, insurgents, successful revolutionists, and war claims. Within these categories there are many varying degrees of liability, and many points of law to be considered. Although it would not be profitable to consider in any detail the law on these points, it may be of interest to note here Dr. Borchard's summing up of the underlying principles upon which these claims are made. He says:

"Private individuals are in no sense authorities of the state. For this reason, their acts do not involve the international responsibility of the state unless the latter by some independent delinquency of its own may be charged with a violation of its international obligations. The first of these obligations in so far as it affects the present subject is to furnish legislative, administrative and judicial machinery which normally would protect the alien against injuries to his person or property by private individuals. (Grotius, II, ch.21, Sec. 2.; Vattel, liv. II, Ch. VI, Secs.71-73, etc.) This does not mean that the governmental machinery of the state must be so efficient as to prevent all injury to aliens - for this would make of the state a guarantor of the security of aliens - but simply that its legislation, its police, and its courts, whatever the form of government, must be so organized that a violent act by one private individual upon another is only a fortuitous event and that the judicial channels for legal recourse against the wrong-doer are freely open. A second and subsidiary duty, a default in which has often served to fasten responsibility upon the state, is the use of due diligence to prevent the injury, and in a criminal case the exertion of all reasonable efforts to bring the offenders to justice.

*Letter from Dr. James L. Barton to Mr. Fennel P. Turner, April 3, 1924
See also Chinese Recorder, Dec. 1924

"It is a fundamental principle that the legislation of a state must be such as to enable it to fulfill its international duties. Its law must impose penalties upon the violation by individuals - natives, residents or aliens - of the international obligations of the state. . . ."* Under the heading Special Protection in Certain Cases, he makes the statement that:

"The obligation to indemnify arising out of a treaty guaranty of special protection, regardless of any delinquency of the authorities, is illustrated in the case of the Panama riot claims of 1856 against New Granada, which the latter country satisfied on account of having undertaken, by article 35 of the Treaty of 1846 with the United States, 'to preserve peace and good order along the transit route'. Wherever a government obligates itself to preserve order, as weak countries frequently do, claims for injuries arising out of mob violence are usually rigorously prosecuted. China, indeed, regardless of treaties, has in innumerable cases been held to a degree of responsibility amounting actually to a guaranty of the security of persons and property of aliens. (In fact, so frequent have been the cases of murder of missionaries by rioters in China that a practice of the U.S. has grown up fixing the sum of \$5,000 as indemnity for a human life. The British and French governments exact as heavy indemnities as possible, and exemplary damages as well, in flagrant cases. These cases in China are illustrated by the following incidents: The Boxer movement, Moore's Dig. V, 476-533; the Lienchow indemnity, For. Rel., 1908, 146; other cases in For. Rel., etc.) Turkey, Morocco and other countries where governmental control is weak and civil disorders are not an abnormal condition are held only to a slightly narrower degree of responsibility."**

C. Method of Making Claims.

One other point must be considered; i.e., the method of presenting claims. The following methods have at various times been followed; the method of the missionary presenting the claim directly to the local authority; of the missionary presenting the claim to the local consul who presents it to the local authority; of the missionary presenting it to the local consul who sends it to Washington for settlement with the central government; and finally of the missionary sending a statement for individual claims to the Mission Board for the Board to forward to the U.S. Government for settlement with the Chinese Government. In respect to local settlement of claims, Secretary Hay, in 1901, sent the following communication to a consul in China expressing the official attitude in the matter:

*Borchard, p. 213-214

**Borchard, p. 222

Mr. Hay to Mr. Squiers.

Department of State,
Washington, July 17, 1901

Sir:

"I have to acknowledge the receipt of your despatch, No. 640 of May 28 last reporting that the governor of Shantung, in his desire to appease the missionaries has agreed to pay a claim presented by Messrs. Crawford & Hudson.

"You say: 'It seems to me unfortunate that the missionary, owing to his peculiar status, can present and recover damages that an ordinary resident of the country will be precluded from doing, under the rules recently adopted by the foreign representatives. . . I have reference to Traveling expenses to and from the United States, and extra living expenses while there.', and you add that the settlement by missionaries of the claims of native Christians has caused no end of criticism and ill feeling especially in the province of Chihli, and among foreigners as well as Chinese;* and that while it might be at times a source of great annoyance and trouble to our consuls and the legation you think that in the end it would prove to the best interests of the missionaries and their work if they were precluded from any official intercourse whatever with the local officials on matters pertaining to these native Christians.

"In reply I have to say that, while unable to apply coercion to American citizens in the provinces to prevent their compromising their claims with the local authorities this Department has in its instructions to the consuls, uniformly discouraged independent negotiations between individuals sufferers and the district officers for the adjustment of alleged losses, and has enjoined upon the consuls non-intervention to bring about any such personal settlement of difficulties which, so far as this Government is concerned, are being settled in the course of the general negotiations at Peking.

"On the 20th of December last an instruction in that sense was sent to the consul at Amoy, which I quote for your information, as follows:

"I have to acknowledge the receipt of your No. 49 of Nov. 7, 1900, reporting that you have adjusted all the claims for damages to American mission property and have received in settlement thereof the sum of \$3,000 Mexican.

"The good disposition of the local authorities is appreciated and if the settlement affected by you is acceptable to the sufferers, the Department does not oppose it. Such partial and scattered settlements can not, however, affect this Government in dealing with the general question of a settlement with the Chinese Government which shall secure deterrent and exemplary punishment and afford guaranties for future safety of our citizens.

"The position maintained by this Government is that international indemnities especially for Americans murdered are adjustable by the Peking Treaty, and that the negotiations can not be divided by separate local demands. If the local

*No. 355 (in House Documents 57th Cong. 1st Session, 1901-02.
4268, pp. 98-99)

authorities offer to repair local losses by direct arrangement with the sufferers, officers of this Government are neither to support nor to object to them.

"'You will act accordingly in the future.'

"On the 21st of the same month an instruction of similar tenor was sent to the Consul at Fuchau.

"While regarding these separate compositions of claims as unsanctioned and as not involving any responsibility on the part of this Government to effect their execution, the Department must necessarily take equitable cognizance of them as matters of fact if for no other reason than to bar any duplicate claim upon the international indemnity by reason of the same losses. Hence they should, whenever possible, be reported to the Department, for its information by the legation or the consuls.*

John Hay."

In a recent private communication from China it has been suggested that all claims be filed with the mission boards and if necessary be presented by the mission boards to the government in order to secure as uniform a policy as possible.

MISSIONARY ATTITUDE TOWARD INDEMNITIES

Although missionary societies cannot legally force the government to act, or to abstain from acting, nevertheless a certain latitude is allowed to missionaries in relation to indemnities. The government is unofficially influenced by the expressed opinion of the Societies. Moreover, missions are free to determine their own attitude in relation to the accepting of indemnity money from their government.

For this reason it is well to give careful consideration to the action of the Boards at various times.

A. Opinion on Indemnities prior to the Boxer Uprising.

The Boxer Uprising brought the question of indemnities to a sharp issue. Before that time missions had received the customary protection and when damage was done had received compensation. To be sure, some question had been raised as to the duty of the government to protect missionaries in the interior of China, but Secretaries Low and Hay had been prompt and effective in their aid to missionaries. Offenders were punished and indemnities paid whenever occasion demanded. *In 1896 at The Foreign Missions Conference of North America, Dr. S.L. Baldwin in a paper on "The Relations of Boards, Missionaries and Converts to Governments, Home and Foreign" had said:

"It is one of the functions of government to assure justice to the governed, and to protect them in the exercise of their rights. Missionaries may justly claim protection as citizens pursuing a lawful calling. Boards may properly ask that the Government shall give to them the same recognition that is given to other corporations engaged in legitimate business. A missionary does not cease to be a citizen when he becomes a foreign missionary, any more than a merchant ceases to be a citizen when he goes to establish himself in mercantile business in a foreign lands, or a traveller when he goes abroad for purposes of pleasure or of discovery

"We must hold steadfastly to the rights of our missionaries as citizens abroad, engaged in honorable occupations and entitled to full protection of their lives, persons and property

*Report of Committees of the House of Representatives. 1st Session, 49th Congress, 1885-86. Document no. 2044. Series No. 2441, p. 41-53.

"The missionary in a foreign land should always remember that he is a guest. Imperious airs are not becoming. Requests are more in place than demands. Much patience should be exercised. The fewer the calls he makes upon the government the better. But, on the other hand, he should never surrender his rights as a citizen of his country; and when necessity arises he can stand firmly on those rights, and ask the government to protect his life and save his property from destruction. In most cases a firm and steady demand by the representative of his government will secure all that is needed. 'I am an American citizen' ought to be fully as effective to-day as 'I am a Roman citizen' was in the centuries that are gone. These principles are elementary, inherent in the very relation of the government and the citizen to each other. They are seldom denied by any representative of our own government or by the authorities of foreign nations."

The view expresses in this paper found hearty endorsement in the resolutions of the Conference.

B. After the Boxer Uprising in 1900: Opinion for and against Indemnities.

Shortly after this the Boxer Rebellion occurred. The first reaction to these atrocities was one of horror. Some missions called for punitive measures as indeed the government did. Some accepted only indemnity for lives and property lost. Some refused indemnity for lives lost, accepting only a very moderate indemnity for damages to property. In the 1901 Report of the Foreign Missions Conference of North America, Dr. F.F. Ellinwood put the case very strongly in favor of indemnities. He said:

"We have thus far dealt with this question from the standpoint of the governments or of the foreign communities in general or of the citizens of the commonwealth at home. It remains to inquire what should be the attitude of the missionaries themselves. Shall they demand protection of their rights, and, if so, when and how far? We have considered citizenship as one and the same everywhere, at home and abroad. It follows that if religious beliefs or employments are to exclude any class from protection in a foreign land, the same distinctions should exclude them here at home. Unless strong reasons can be shown to the contrary, missionaries in China should be included in the same category with the pastors of the churches, theological professors, or missionary secretaries engaged in religious work at home. Does the fact of engaging in Christian work, in itself, whether in this country or in any other, invalidate the claim for protection? It can not be a matter of geography. If a clergyman's house has been looted and destroyed by a mob of drunken soldiers, or with the instigation or connivance of public officials here in the commonwealth of New York, should the homeless family waive all claims for indemnity? Or if he were a home missionary, ought his board of society to meet the loss? It is difficult for us, who dwell safely in our Christian homes under enlightened governments, to judge of the situation as missionaries have viewed it from their standpoint of danger. No doubt there would be one opinion, and only one, in regard to the course which should be pursued if a mob in this country were to loot the property and take the lives of members of any law-abiding

religious society. No one would claim that their religious beliefs ought to arrest the execution of justice, either in regard to the property destroyed, or to the punishment of the assassins.

"There has been an unwarrantable outburst of criticism against missionaries at Peking for the strong ground which they took in regard to the necessity of punishment for the Boxers and guilty officials. They made this plea not for themselves - for they were safe - but for the security of missionaries elsewhere, and in all the future. While we would encourage moderation in the demands of the Governments for punishment, even though as a safeguard for the future, we would still remind citizens of the United States or the British Empire that the position of the missionaries is precisely that which everybody without exception would take were such atrocities to break out here at home. It would be felt that the very foundations of order and public security were at stake. There is no justice, therefore, in branding the missionaries as "bloodthirsty" when, with the impression of outrage and danger which has been made upon them by displays of unparalleled atrocity, they advocated the terrors of the law as the only means of future safety. They were doubtless convinced that this necessity, instead of being weaker in China than under the same circumstances in America, is stronger, from the very nature of the people with whom they have to deal.

"The question, how far missionaries may waive their claims is a complex question, and distinctions should be made, first between the claims of an individual missionary for personal indemnity, and the claims of the mission or the missionary society which he represents; and we should also consider the bearing of his action upon the safety of other citizens of foreign countries according to the principles of which we have spoken above. New Testament examples may throw some light upon this point. A distinction, similar to that here suggested, was observed by Paul. He felt at liberty to submit to indignity and cruel persecution at Lystra and Iconium, while at the same time, he does not appear to have felt that he had any right to waive his claim as a Roman citizen when arraigned before public officials at Philippi. He was insistent not only upon his personal liberty, but even upon a formal and official recognition of it, feeling, doubtless, that great principles were at stake which he had no right to disregard . . . , "

In the discussion of this paper Dr. C.F. Reid, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, said:

"In reference to the indemnity to be demanded of China for the crimes against person or property, it is perfectly proper and just that the perpetrators should be punished according to their crimes. But as to compensation for the lives of missionaries, I am authorized to say that our board does not believe that any demand should be made by the boards. We believe that it will be a far better policy for the boards to treat those who may be dependent upon those who were killed as is customary in other cases.

* Ellinwood, Rev. F.F. Relations of Missions and Missionaries to Governments (in Report of the Foreign Missions Conference of North America, 1901, p.93-95.

"We feel also that it would be very unfortunate for the missionaries to make any demand for compensation in the case of property destroyed that should be in the least immoderate; that compensation should be very moderate, and every bill for losses should be most carefully gone over, to see that no extravagant charges are made

"I believe that if the missionaries join in the hue and cry for compensation they will lose in the estimation of the Chinese the character for unselfish effort, which for 100 years they have been at such great pains to build up.

"Another point: The Chinese have a way, whenever indemnity is claimed for a wrong perpetrated in any given spot, of not making those who perpetrated the crime bear the burden of the indemnity. The central government claims to do this, but practically they demand that the local gentry and men of means pay the bill without reference to whether they had any part in the perpetration of the crime or not. Now, it so happens that in a city like Foo Chow, there are a great many people who have been very friendly to our missions there. They have subscribed something like \$20,000 to educational establishments in that section within the last year. Suppose we had lost some property there and an indemnity had to be paid. The officials would say that those men who had been most friendly to us would be the very ones who would have to bear the greater part of the burden."

The same attitude was adopted by the Reformed Church in America, as may be seen by the following extract from their 1901 Report:

"Damage was done to the newly erected chapel at Lungeoa, and smaller chapels in three other outstations connected with the Chiang-chiu field. For these losses ample though moderate reparation was made by the Taotai through the efficient intervention of the consul. 'Exemplary damages' collected by him, and offered to the mission on certain conditions were declined by direction of the Executive Committee."

In the autumn of 1901 a conference was held of representatives of the different missionary boards and societies, and it was agreed:

"First, that as far as possible a uniform policy should be adopted by the Boards and Societies represented. Second, that no aggressive claims should be made for loss of property, but that in response to specific requests of the State Department, all such losses should be reported."*

The China Inland Mission held a more extreme view. In "The Jubilee Story of the China Inland Mission," p.256-257, we find the following statement:

* The Sixty-Fourth Annual Report of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., 1901, p. 12.

"In the task of reorganization, one problem in particular had to be carefully and prayerfully considered, and that was the Missions' attitude toward compensation. Long before the general question arose, it had been raised locally by the Governor of Chekiang, who was anxious without delay to make what reparation was possible for the massacres at Chuchowfu. Mr. Taylor, who had been approached on this subject, had advised the Mission 'To claim for nothing, but to accept, where offered, compensation for destroyed Mission premises and property;' as I feel, he wrote, 'we hold these on trust for God's work For injury or loss of life to refuse all compensations.'

"These decisions, however, were subsequently modified in the light of fuller knowledge and further consideration. Thousands of Chinese, many of them as innocent as the missionaries, had been ruined and robbed of their all, and sometimes slain through the action of the allied troops, whose conduct was not always beyond reproach. The importance of making clear to the Chinese the distinction between the principles which govern the action of missionaries, as witnesses to Christ and the Gospel, and those of the temporal power, as entrusted with the vindication of law and order, was more and more recognized as the extent of the losses and sufferings inflicted upon the Chinese became known. It was felt that an admirable opportunity presented itself of showing to the Chinese, in a way that they could readily appreciate, 'the meekness and gentleness of Christ,' and therefore it was finally decided not only not to enter any claim against the Chinese government, but to refrain from accepting compensation even if offered. Though the damage to property amounted to many thousands of pounds, it was believed that if the policy adopted were glorifying to God, He would provide what was necessary."

The same attitude was taken by the Church Missionary Society and the C. E. Z. M. S. In "The History of the Church Missionary Society" Eugene Stock says:

"... One other thing the British Government could do. It could demand of China compensation for outrages. This is legitimate in the case of property, as when Stewart's College was destroyed in 1878. But when Lord Salisbury enquired of the C.M.S. and C.E.Z.M.S., what compensation he was to press for on account of the Hwasang (Kuchong) massacre, both Societies replied that they would accept none. Any money paid might have been regarded in China as an indemnity for the lives of the missionaries; and both Committees were anxious to avoid even the appearance of vindictiveness. In due course, Lord Salisbury wrote to the C.M.S. that the Chinese authorities were much impressed by the 'high-minded attitude' of the Societies. The Tsungli-Yamen (Chinese Foreign Office) informed Sir Claude Macdonald, the British Minister at Peking, that 'the refusal to accept compensation commanded the Yamen's profound respect and esteem,' and that every effort would be made to prevent future disturbances"

*Stock, Eugene, History of the Church Missionary Society, London, Vol. III, p. 587.

In 1906 the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church, following out their policy already established, voted formally to take no indemnity for the lives of its missionaries and no punitive indemnity whatever.*

C. World Missionary Conference, Edinburgh, 1910.

Opinion on the Boxer indemnities found well considered and widely representative expression in the Findings of the Commission VII of the World Missionary Conference, Edinburgh, 1910. Their statement on the question of compensation in China is quoted here in full:

"When persecution has broken out in violent form, and there has been loss of property and life, should compensation be sought from the Chinese Government? This question has been fully answered by many representative missionaries. There are a few who think that full legal rights should be exacted from the Chinese Government, a few also, on the other hand, who hold that a Mission in China should never make any claim. The majority, however, occupy a middle position.

"There is almost entire unanimity in the attitude taken towards compensation for loss of life. Martyr lives are things for which no compensation should be asked or even received by any Mission. Nor should the relatives of the deceased missionary be encouraged to ask for it, it being understood that the Mission concerned itself makes reasonable provision for the family dependent on him. Chinese Christians, having a different kind of claim upon the Chinese Government, may not fall under this rule; and no consensus of opinion can be affirmed as to their case.

"Most missionaries take up a different position in respect of compensation for buildings, etc., destroyed, and other pecuniary losses. A money equivalent can be stated and is justly due. But should it be demanded? Some hold that it should, on the ground that, not treaty rights alone, but the very Chinese sense of fairness, make it advisable in the interests of order and justice. Others consider that it may be received if offered, but that it should not be demanded, for Christian Missions in China should not stand upon their legal rights. But nearly all are agreed in saying that there are circumstances under which compensation should be declined or returned. The compensation may be made by an assessment, oppressive, corrupt, and irritating, upon the town or district, which enriches the officials and casts odium upon the Christian name. Or there may be other circumstances which make it a matter of Christian expediency to bear the loss.

"In any case, it is agreed, nothing more than the bare equivalent for the damage should be taken, - nothing but what a fair-minded Chinese would himself

*Bulletin No. 10 of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church:
See The Nation, Aug. 2, 1906, p. 96-97.

recognize as just. Missions should have nothing whatever to do with sums levied as a punitive measure upon the Chinese.

"In the case of private losses of missionaries and Chinese Christians, the question of compensation must be left to themselves, except where the Mission takes upon itself the duty of compensation and the right of applying, if found expedient, to the Government for private as well as Mission claims. Elsewhere the Missions can only ask their people to weight the possible effect of patient endurance and forgiveness, against the possible effect of increasing lawlessness by the surrender of a just and legal claim.

"The foregoing remarks do not, of course, apply to claims made by the Minister or Consul for wrongs done to the 'nationals' under his protection, and the insult or injury to his country which is involved. Missionaries generally recognize that the diplomatic agents have distinct principles of action, and may even demand punitive measures. But they hold that Missions should not profit by them."*

It is of interest to note here what the Edinburgh Conference reports for areas other than China, and the general conclusions drawn from these reports.

Japan

"The Government of Japan, as a highly civilized Power, recognises its duty both to its own subjects and to law-abiding citizens of friendly Powers residing within its borders. Missionaries, like merchants or travellers, confidently look to it to prevent lawlessness, threatening danger to life or destruction to property. And compensation would doubtless be looked upon as a just claim. Nevertheless, in the most advanced non-Christian land, Christian Missions have to consider the result of claiming their legal rights upon the temper of the people. When in Tokyo a riot, caused by dissatisfaction with the terms of peace at the close of the war with Russia, led to the damaging of some mission property, most if not all of the Missions affected thought it inadvisable to ask for compensation from the Government. Contributions made by Christians, Shintoists, and Buddhists compensated for a part of the damage."**

Dutch East Indies

"... as occasionally has happened, mission property has been damaged or destroyed, the missionaries have refused to accept any compensation which was levied from the population by special fines." ***

Turkey

"... missionaries in Turkey are tolerably unanimous in maintaining the

* World Missionary Conference, 1910, Report of Commission VII: Missions and Governments, p. 17-18.

** World Missionary Conference, 1910; Report of Commission VII: Missions and Governments, p. 56.

*** Idem, p. 39.

need for claiming their treaty rights. For wrongs done of an illegal nature (if they are of any importance) redress is usually sought through the Consul or Ambassador, generally with satisfactory results. Such intervention does not irritate the people, who generally have considerable regard for the missionaries; nor does it seem to annoy the officials, except the person against whose action protest is made. One missionary affirms that the officials rather feel it due to their dignity that the Consul should take the matter in hand; but most of them find that a direct appeal to the Turkish Officials is more pleasing to the latter, and more quickly successful to themselves."*

Abyssinia

" . . . He (the representative of the Swedish Mission) is an advocate of missionaries using their full rights in such a country, as submission to injustice and oppression is merely looked upon as an invitation to further insults and injuries."**

In conclusion the Commission reported:

"In general we think that the propriety of acceptance of indemnity by a Mission is in large degree a question as to the stage of advancement reached by a people by whom wrong to the Mission has been committed. In savage islands, while acceptance of voluntary restitution of losses and endeavour to promote the disposition to offer this might be justifiable and commendable, it is plain that the invoking of foreign aid in the interests for redress for wrong would be indefensible. On the other hand, in countries in which freedom of belief and religious effort is protected by guarantees representative of a preponderating public sentiment, cooperation with Government in its requirement of just reprisal for wrong is a duty. The practical issue to be met by Missionary Societies relates to the time when, in any given land or locality, such conditions have been reached that the balance of obligation inclines to the side of cooperation in support of just principles of national and international law. We are inclined to hold the general position that, in cases in which freedom of action by Missionary Societies in respect to the receipt of indemnities is conceded by their own Government, a large permanent good will result if these Societies follow a practice of returning indemnities in cases in which these do not represent a genuinely free action of the authorities, supported in a reasonable degree by a favorable public sentiment.

"The practice of forbearance should not be followed irrespective of its bearing on the interests of others. Duty to the community may rightly cause a missionary to hold an attitude with regard to wrongs suffered by him different from that which he would hold if the issue concerned only himself. The law of service obviously involves the promotion of social order, and thus involves loyal support of Government in the maintenance of a just administration. Civilised Governments recognise this obligation in provision for compulsory testimony of witnesses in courts of justice, and in the requirement that all citizens shall, upon call, assist officers of the law in making arrests. Wherever a local Government is sincerely committed by its own ideals and by a supporting public

*Idem, p. 47-48.

**Idem, p. 58

sentiment to requirement of indemnity for wrongdoing, we think that the missionary and the Missionary Society are under obligation to cooperate with the Government in its efforts thus to serve the true interests of its people. One thing, however, seems to us to be plain. Any appearance of self-interest, of personal exaction or resentment, is to be scrupulously avoided. As a rule, initiative may well be left to the Government, acceptance of indemnity being greatly preferable to a demand for it. Pressure for a high valuation of losses is not inconsistent, and acceptance of indemnity obviously in excess of losses would be deplorable. The influence of the missionary and the Missionary Society should be on the side of leniency in the action of Government, and absolutely against unjust exaction. Where the innocent are involved in the payment, a generous attitude is the more important, and consideration may well be given in such cases to the possibility of return of the payment in part, or of relief, by donations to local interests. The personal attitude should be unmistakable - that of disinterestedness and kindness; but cooperation in promoting the just ends of a just Government, is a plain obligation, not inconsistent with, but involved in fidelity to the law of service.

"If Christian missions rest upon a just basis and are, therefore, legitimately entitled to the same protection accorded other interests, will not a course involving a quiet assumption of this ultimately be most helpful to all interests?

"Advocacy of acceptance of indemnity under international action may, we think, be made from very pure motives and on high grounds in the interests of true and lasting service of mankind."*

D. China 1910 - 1926.

After the Boxer trouble subsided, occasional riots continued to cause alarm and distress in China. Mission policy in relation to indemnities was still divided. A section felt that missionary forces should seek reparation in order to force the government to establish order. An argument for this attitude was presented in an article in the Chinese Recorder in 1910. After going to some length to prove that the Bible authority is not conclusively in favor of "no indemnities", the writer puts forth the following arguments:

"The next argument against indemnities is the bitter feeling engendered in the hearts of the Chinese for having to pay them. There is a great deal of misapprehension on this point . . . on this matter I can speak with authority. The bitter feeling against foreigners, which existed in Hunan when I first travelled in the province was so intense that when I talk about it now people find it hard to believe me. The people did not know then that China had ever

*Idem, p. 108-9

paid an indemnity to any foreign power. . . but they did know that all foreign powers paid tribute to China, and I was despised and maltreated accordingly. . . At what remote date this bitter feeling was engendered I do not know, but I am sure that it exists now because it is carefully cultivated by certain classes and the infliction of indemnities acts as a cure. . .

"The fact that it is not the people who have done the injustice that have to pay.'.. As a matter of fact the money is paid from the public treasury, and although it has already been taken, or will be taken from the pockets of the people it does not follow that they are at all conscious of the process of its abstraction. . .

"It would be better for the interest of the work if all claims to indemnity were waived'. . . a few years ago a British Mission had two of its members massacred by a mob at their Station in Hunan. The British Consul demanded indemnity in spite of the fact that the mission protested, and refused to accept it. . . Ultimately two American Missions accepted the responsibility of spending the money for the benefit of the Hunan people. One of these has a splendid hospital and flourishing mission at the scene of the tragedy now, while the Mission to which the martyrs belonged is no longer represented in the city. (Other examples are given to prove value of taking indemnity money). . .

"Having answered to the best of my ability the arguments against the acceptance of indemnities, I wish to bring forward a few in favour of the opposite party.

"A. The Directors of the Mission Boards are not altogether free agents in the matter of refusing. They are the trustees of certain moneys which have been given to them for a particular purpose and are not at liberty to allow them to be misapplied to something else. . .

"B. Neither are missionaries free agents. Even as respects their own lives they are only Trustees. The value of the life belongs to those who are dependent on it, and if that value can, in a measure, be made good when a life is taken, it ought to be done. Some will accept indemnity for property destroyed, but refuse it for life destroyed. They call it 'blood money'. . . But blood money is the money paid for causing the death of any person - the hire of the assassin - and to apply it to the indemnity paid to relatives of an assassinated man is a misuse of terms. . . .

"C. By refusing indemnities missionaries place their government in a difficult position. It cannot stand by and see its nationals slaughtered and do nothing. It is the missionary's duty therefore to consider and say what better method there is of dealing with such cases than on the indemnity plan. . .

"D. Refusal puts the Chinese government in a difficult position. The Chinese do not understand gratuitous condonation. If a case is not settled and put away they consider that it is booked up against them, to be brought forward at another time and payment exacted with compound interest. . . .

"E. The refusal of indemnities places missions in a difficult position. There are in China any number of churches, hospitals, schools, and missionary residences which, through indemnities, rose from their ashes, when, but for these, they would have been in ashes yet. Almost every large centre, in this part of China, has its riot at some time or other, but the rule is, never oftener than once at the same

place. Nothing discourages such efforts so much as to see the establishments which had been destroyed re-erected at the expense of those who did the mischief, and more firmly rooted than ever. I shall be told that such establishments can never expect to be blessed, but experience shows that their work progresses rapidly and perhaps more rapidly than if there had never been a riot at all.

"F. The refusal of indemnities places widows and orphans in a difficult position. It dooms them to a life of dependence on the bounty of friends and relatives. . . .

"G. It also places the native Christians in a difficult position. They must be taught to follow the missionary's example. . . . If our teaching is that they must submit cheerfully to robbery, spoliation, incendiarism, and murder, not only without seeking redress, but even refusing it when offered, we are laying down a standard which no community in this world ever made a success of.

"H. Granting that riots will happen, to exact indemnities is good for China, or any other country where the like is allowed to prevail. . . . The best friends of China are not those who condone her wrong doing, but those who make her atone for them."*

The next step in the development of the situation in China was the invasion of the country by Bandits. Soldiers without discipline, invading a section of the country pillaging and destroying lives and property. This presented to the missions another angle of the perplexing indemnity problem.

Mr. Frederick Onley, sums up the missionary attitude in a short paragraph on the subject in the China Mission Year Book for 1924; he says:

"Much mission and church property has been destroyed, and many Christians have suffered from captivity, and some have lost their lives. In some cases, there has been a noticeable keenness to urge the missionary to claim compensation, and when this has been refused, some bitterness has been caused but this has been modified when missionaries have refrained from claiming compensation for personal and mission losses. The opinion of the Chinese outside the church has been that this is a sign of weakness, and some of the more ignorant have turned from the evangelistic appeal with scorn in consequence. This is probably due to a belief in the church as a help in litigation and a survival from past methods of propaganda. On a full explanation of the reasons being given, the outsiders and church members have appreciated the point of view that inasmuch as indemnities in most cases come from added taxes placed on local people (who in most cases have themselves suffered from bandits with no hope of redress) it is a generous and Christian act to forego any claim on the Chinese Government. The attitude of the consular officials and business community generally is that indemnities should be claimed in order to force the government to protect the lives and property of foreigners.

*Archibald, J. The Case for Indemnities (in The Chinese Recorder)
(Nov. 1910, p. 713-726)

"On the part of the missionary community, opinion is divided. In the case of one mission, the L. M. S., the experience of the harm done to the evangelistic work by the acceptance of indemnities in 1900, has led them to refuse unanimously any claim for destruction of property at Tsaoshih,. At Kuling in the summer of 1923 a resolution at a meeting of missionaries looking to the relinquishment of the use of force and the exercise of extraterritorial rights found a majority against it, but it is said more might have been in favour had the wording been different."*

In speaking of International Agreements, Dr. D. E. Hoste, of the C. I. M. makes a very pertinent statement on the subject of intervention; he says:

"Speaking with considerable experience, the writer ventures to affirm with confidence that the policy of suffering wrongfully rather than requesting official intervention will do more to conserve and promote the good name of the country to which the missionary belongs than the other course of appealing to consular intervention."**

It is also significant to note a new attitude on the part of the Chinese finding expression today. T. C. Chao is quoted as saying:

"We need to understand that such foreign protection and indemnity money as we receive from the hands of our missionary friends are obstacles to the gospel of peace and love and to the Kingdom of God. . . . Henceforth, all patriotic Chinese Christians must do the following things: 1. Be determined not to receive foreign protection when in danger; 2. Refuse to receive indemnity money secured by foreign help, or intervention, for the loss of lives and property."***

When Dr. R. E. Speer was in China in the fall of 1926 the question of indemnities came up at various conferences. Although no final decision was reached it is important to note the action taken. In his Report on Japan and China, Dr. Speer says:

"In several of the conferences the difficult question of relations of missions and missionaries to governments and to political rights, including the problem of indemnities for loss of life or property was discussed. Various proposals were made and rejected. The Shanghai Conference took no action and this was the only Conference whose Findings were authoritative. The only regional Conference which took action was Tsinanfu. There a Committee presented the following resolution:

*Onley, Frederick, The Bandit Situation and Christian Work. (in The China Mission Year Book, 1924, p. 7-15.

**Hoste, D.E., The Christian Attitude Toward Present International Agreements (in the Chinese Recorder, April 1924, p. 250)

***The Church in China and International Agreements (The Chinese Recorder, April 1924, p. 241)

"The Committee proposes that the conference recommend to the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions that it should neither seek nor accept indemnity for the loss of missionary life or property, or of mission property, caused by riots or mobs or as a result of civil wars.

"We make this recommendation in the belief that it is in accord with the teaching and practice of our Master.

"In no way can we more clearly reveal Jesus Christ to those who have injured us than to forgive them, and out of love to them, refrain from enforcing legal rights.'

"The Tsinanfu Conference was not prepared to adopt this and substituted for it the following resolution offered by Dr. Lowrie:

"While this Conference recognizes the evils arising from an abuse of existing rights of a foreign resident to be indemnified for loss by violence in a foreign land, it is of the opinion that such rights may better be waived by individuals and by the Board of Foreign Missions at discretion than that such rights of citizenship as are recognized by foreign nations the world over be disallowed altogether.'

"This whole problem of political rights and relationships is, as the Board knows from discussions in its own meetings, a very difficult one. The early Church found it so, as one may read in Cadoux's great volume on 'The Early Church and the World'. Probably the Conferences did well in not trying to make any statement regarding it. Any attempt at statement finds it difficult to combine the natural view and instinct of the missionary spirit and the clear policy of our government as stated repeatedly in the Evarts doctrine and by the present administration and very distinctly by President Taft in 1909. . . . In the case of Japan and China it is now proposed by some that the difficulty should be met and the missionary delivered from all implication in international affairs through the naturalization of the missionary as a full citizen of the land to which he goes. Dr. Timothy Lew urged this at the Foreign Mission Conference of the American and Canadian Boards, January 1927. There is something to be said for the proposal. Dr. David Trumbull did this in Chile and Dr. Verbeck would have done it in Japan if there had been any provision for naturalization at that time. At present, however, the plan would probably be found impracticable. It would mean the transfer of nationality for wife and children too and many things would result for which I suspect neither China nor missionaries are now prepared. Probably the suggestion looks forward to the day when Foreign Missions will have really ended in China and when the Chinese Church if it wants help from abroad will call men to come to China and to become Chinese citizens just as we now call men from Europe to come to us to become American professors or pastors."*

Dr. James L. Barton has summed up the situation in regard to citizenship as follows:

*Speer, Robert E., Reprint on Japan and China, 1926, p. 431-433

"If a missionary is convinced that he ought not to claim or receive national protection, and his failure to do so imperils others of his nationals, he might consider becoming a subject or a citizen of the country to which he is giving his life. Then there could be no occasion for his former government to interfere in case he had trouble. If there appeared difficulty in securing citizenship in countries like Japan, China and Turkey, he might vacate his own citizenship and so be without a country and therefore quite removed from temptation to appeal for personal protection. Perhaps on the whole this would make the most complete demonstration possible of his purpose to live among the people for whom he labours as one of them with no protection that they did not also possess. This might apply not only to countries under extra-territorial privileges but to all missionary lands. In no other way can a missionary completely empty himself of his nationality so as not to give the impression to the native populations that he has behind him a great, powerful, protecting nation."*

Attention should be called, however, to the fact that if missionaries should become citizens of China they would receive protection and indemnities would be paid for loss of property or life. In Chinese tradition indemnities are primarily a family responsibility and a community responsibility, entirely a local affair. By relinquishing American citizenship in favor of Chinese citizenship missionaries would not exempt themselves from indemnity but would merely change the authority under which the indemnities would be collected. The Chinese believe in indemnity and collect indemnity for wrongs done their own citizens as well as to foreigners.

It has been possible in certain instances to stipulate by treaty between the two sovereign powers concerned the way in which the indemnity is to be levied. One instance of this policy was in an argument with Persia, when Mr. Larabee, a Presbyterian missionary, was murdered. The U. S. Government demanded indemnity from Persia despite the fact that Mrs. Larabee made a specific request that no demand be made, stating that she felt that such a step would do harm to the missionary cause and that the sum would be levied by the Persian Government on innocent people in the area where her husband was killed. The U. S. Government stipulated therefore that the sum should not be levied locally but should be paid from the general treasury.

*Barton, James L., Some Missionary Activities in Relation to Governments (in International Review of Missions, July 1924, p. 340-359)

The policy of indemnities borders very closely on the entire policy of the relation of missions and governments. Beneath all matters such as extra-territoriality, citizenship, and indemnities, one might well expect to find a consistent ideal, though policies may vary to suit circumstances. Dr. James L. Barton, in the conclusion of an article on Missionary Activities and Governments,* expresses the philosophy that lies back of much of the missionary thinking today. He says:

"The aim of the missionary should be to get as close as possible to the people he seeks to serve. Everything he retains that gives the impression that he is a foreigner possessing special privileges erects barriers between him and the people he would reach. This does not necessarily mean that he should adopt native dress and live in all respects as the people about him live but it does mean that he should in language and in his manner of life avoid giving the impression that he is a member of a dominant foreign nation which stands ready to defend him in time of danger and avenge his death in case of violence. The missionary's methods of approach and his contact with the people he would best serve are watched to-day and discussed as they have never been before. Perhaps as at no other period in modern missions has the life of a missionary and his relations to his native colleagues been more under observation or more powerful in commending or condemning the religion he is supposed to exemplify.

"Educated and travelled natives in all the great missionary countries are rapidly increasing in numbers and are found not only in the mission fields but in the home lands as well. Many of these have studied Christianity but have not accepted it. Others are sincere Christians, but all have a high conception of what the missionary life should be. These do not hesitate to criticise when they see a missionary giving what seems to them undue care to his personal comfort, calling upon foreign forces to protect him from the perils which threaten people all about him for whom there is no foreign protection, or when they see him perform and encourage acts which are intended to deceive. The missionary lives and works in a special sense in the limelight, his life and acts should be such as to commend his religion to all as good to believe and adequate for life, and quite different from that of the other foreigners who make no profession of altruism. While the missionary is thus under close scrutiny, he is in a position, however, so to exemplify the life and teachings of Jesus Christ and His gospel as to make a wide-reaching impression such as was not possible a generation ago. If his life commends his teaching, he becomes a powerful preacher of righteousness. If it does not commend his teaching, the evil that he does is wide-spread. Hence it is important that the missionary should recognize that the position he holds is unique, quite different from that of merchants and travellers or even of diplomatic representatives of his government. If he is in a country over which his own government rules, his position is made doubly difficult because of the tendency on the part of the native populations to regard him as a department of the government itself. In a word, the missionary of this day must be truly a man of God, with a passion for making Jesus Christ in His beauty and saving grace known to all with whom he comes in contact and even to the nation of which he is the guest. Anything that militates against this is harmful. Everything that conserves this great and high aim adds to his efficiency and power."

*Barton, James L., Some Missionary Activities in Relation to Governments
(in International Review of Missions, July 1924, P. 340-359)

E. Statements of Policy: 1927

In the present situation we have received some statements of mission policy in China in relation to indemnities, the most outstanding being the statement of the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions in relation to the death of Dr. John E. Williams, of Nanking. The statement is a confirmation of their policy of refusing indemnity for the lives of their missionaries. It is as follows:

"A recent death by violence of the Rev. John E. Williams, D.D., an American citizen, in Nanking" the statement says in part "is the occasion for newspaper references to the possibility of claim by the American Government for indemnity.

"Inasmuch as Dr. Williams was a regularly appointed missionary of the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions, and as the board and the enterprise which it represents would be indirectly affected by any claim for indemnity on account of his death, we call attention to the historic policy of the board regarding this question.

"The Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions has never requested nor accepted indemnity for the death of any missionary and it is fully convinced that in the case of Dr. Williams it should adhere to this long-established practice. The board has in mind not only those essential principles which inhere in the motive and aim of missionary service, but also the welfare of the Christian cause in the place where the violence occurs, especially as experience shows that indemnities are usually collected from innocent people in the local community.

"The board can only speak for itself. It is not authorized to speak for any individual personally concerned in the death of Dr. Williams."*

The Y. M. C. A. in answer to a request concerning their policy on indemnities for damages at Nanking, cabled to China, April 12th the following message:

"David Z. T. Yui, Foreign Committee National Councils United States Canada cooperating with National Committee Y. M. C. A. of China exclusively for the benefit of Chinese people. We sympathize with China in her present difficulties. It is not our desire under any circumstances claim damages for losses to foreign secretaries. F. S. Brockman."**

The Board of Foreign Missions of the American Friends states that:

". . . To date we have suffered no loss in Chengtu, West China. The question with us is therefore a theoretical one, but our Committee came to the united judgment that in case we do suffer loss in the future it would not be wise for us to ask for any indemnity. We are carrying on our work in China under a sense of concern to help the Chinese people. We do not wish to place any embarrassment upon Chinese leaders who may be struggling at the present time for a more democratic form of Government.***

*Oppose Indemnity Over Williams (in New York Times, April 10, 1927, p. 2)

**Letter from Charles A. Herschleb to Dr. A. L. Warnshuis, April 14, 1927.

***Letter from F. Williams Board to Dr. A. L. Warnshuis, April 16, 1927.

In the Minutes of Meeting of Standing Committee of the Conference of Missionary Societies in Great Britain and Ireland on the 18th March, 1927, there is a short statement on the present situation in China. It reads as follows:

"Arising out of a statement made in the House of Commons that claims had been lodged from missionary societies for damage done in the recent troubles, the Societies working in China had been communicated with, and according to information received only two societies had actually taken up the matter in a tentative way. The whole matter was referred to the China Group for further consideration."

We shall probably receive here from time to time further indications of policy which may be issued as a supplement to this report.

III. QUESTIONS TO BE CONSIDERED

Among the specific questions that arise at this time the following seem to be of especial importance to the Boards:

1. Is any distinction to be made between mission policy on indemnities for life and for property?

A recent American Board memorandum on indemnities says: "The word 'Indemnities', as viewed by a Mission Board, has various bearings. It may cover, for example, loss of life or loss of property; or again the loss of property held by the Board directly, or the Mission representatives; or the personal property of the missionaries; or the buildings and equipment owned by the Christian Communities; or the personal property of Christian Compounds; or, once more, it may cover property the title to which is still held by the Mission or Board, but which has been given over to church or other organizations in the Mission area for their management and control.

A primary question, therefore, will be as to how the American Board differentiates the various classes of injury and what different attitude it may take in the case of one or another of them.

2. Should any distinction be made between asking, - presenting a claim, - for indemnity, and receiving an indemnity that has been claimed and collected by the government?

3. Should a Board or Society seek to determine the action of individual missionaries, or their families, who might wish to press personal claims for indemnities that are in accordance with provision therefor approved both by the United States and the nation in question?

4. Is it better policy to make claims by the home board to the government at Washington, or by the mission and/or individual missionaries to the local consul? Is the amount of the indemnity claimed settled by the Home Board or by the missions on the field?

5. Is it desirable that the Boards concerned should endeavor to reach an agreement in defining a common policy regarding these indemnity questions in China at the present time? If so, how should we proceed?

6. As a minimum, would it be advisable to ask the Boards not to take any action without informing the other Boards regarding the proposed action?

Comments on the subject of indemnities and answers to the above questions are invited by the Committee on Missions and Governments. These should be sent to:

A. L. Warnshuis

419 Fourth Avenue,
New York City.

-1-

...of the ... of ...
... of the ... of ...
... of the ... of ...

...

...